emphasises the popular demand for better schools, he does not consider the possibility that, as Reese suggests, working-class groups might welcome the growth of the public schools but not the centralised, bureaucratic form that they assumed. School reform meant different things to different people. Reese sees two alternative conceptions at war with one another: 'a renewed concern for community and human needs on the one hand and a drive toward central and professional control on the other'. In place of the pluralist conception of reform offered by Peterson, he describes a dialectical process, 'a war between democracy and efficiency'. In reaction to the growing centralisation of administrative control, a variety of 'grass-roots movements' campaigned to make the schools more responsive to the needs of children and neighbourhood communities. They fought for, and frequently obtained, such innovations as vacation schools, playgrounds, manual training and domestic science programmes, school meals, health inspection and the use of school buildings as social centres. The 'spirit of civic activism' that characterised educational politics in the Progressive Era drew upon the activities of women's groups, labour and socialist organisations, as well as radical reformers like 'Golden Rule' Jones, who, while starting from different premises, often found common cause, 'growing together...like entangled vines that crossed but did not always join', until the hysterias and repressions of wartime finally pulled them apart. By uncovering the role of organised women, demonstrating the invigorating influence of radicals on progressive reform, and directing our attention away from the statements and actions of educational elites, Reese greatly enriches our understanding of school politics in the Progressive Era. However, his achievement is vitiated by a distinctly stereotyped account of the elites themselves, who are presented very much in 'revisionist' terms as agents of organised 'capital' and proponents of soulless 'efficiency'. This emerges most clearly in his account of the compulsory vaccination controversy. Although Reese, like Peterson, has produced an interesting and challenging book which helps redress recent imbalances in the history of education, the limitations of both works suggest how far we still are from a fully satisfying account of the educational history of the Progressive Era.

University College, Aberystwyth *Robert Harrison*

The United States and Mexico. **By Josefina Zoraida Vázquez and Lorenzo Meyer.** London: University of Chicago Press. 1985. xiv + 220 pp. £24.75.

The Chicago series in which this book appears contains some various stuff. H.G. Nicholas's *The United States and Britain* deals only with the post-war world. This volume, by contrast, tells its tale from the independence of the two nations, Professor Vázquez taking it to the end of the nineteenth century and then handing over to Professor Meyer. Inevitably the work is highly compressed, though the compression is deftly handled. This is a useful account, fairminded and generally turned into readable English. The emphasis, as is proper, is on the Mexican side of the story. It is well to be reminded how strongly Mexicans apparently still feel about the loss of much of their territory more than a century ago, even though it was territory which they barely controlled, which contained few Mexicans, and of which they were making no use. This is primarily a history of inter-governmental relations, even when it deals with matters such as the activities of American companies in Mexico, or Mexican immigration, legal and illegal, into the United States. A reviewer should always be cautious in complaining that authors have not written a book they did not set out to write, but as we are taken rapidly through short-lived Mexican administrations and equally short-lived agreements, this reviewer has the uneasy feeling that the essence of the matter is elsewhere. The difference in power and wealth between the two neighbours has widened greatly since they were both young. Relations between them have always been more important to Mexico than to the United States, and Mexican historians would not dispute that American handling of those relations has often been cavalier rather than positively aggressive. Yet even truncated Mexico does not lack resources. Underlying this history is the sad failure of successive Mexican governments to build a prosperous nation — or allow their people to build it — until population pressure has made the task nearly impossible.

University of Birmingham *A.E. Campbell*

Theodore Roosevelt, Culture, Diplomacy, and Expansion: a New View of American Imperialism. **By Richard H. Collin.** London: Louisiana State University Press. 1985. xiv + 246 pp. £25.00.

This is an irritating and ultimately unsatisfactory work. It is irritating both because Professor Collin batters away repetitively at an Aunt Sally, and because he is trying to blend together two subjects that do not really fit. The Aunt Sally is a simple-minded idea of American imperialism — and indeed of European imperialism also — at the end of the nineteenth century which serious scholars abandoned many years ago. This part of the book, which concentrates on Theodore Roosevelt's diplomacy, contains comments on TR and on international diplomacy with which no one would disagree, and others with which one might take issue while allowing that Professor Collin's view is tenable; but to tell us now, at this length, that Theodore Roosevelt was a responsible statesman, and no mere jingo, is to reinvent the wheel. The other part of the book, which is more original, is about cultural developments in Washington in Roosevelt's day. There are three chapters, on the restoration of the White House, on TR's wide range of guests there during his presidency and, the most original, on the gift to the nation of the Freer art collection, which TR supported. In the United States as in other countries self-confident men of wealth often turned to collecting art, and often with remarkable discrimination. Charles Lang Freer was one such: however one may rate his Whistlers, his oriental collection is a marvel. But Professor Collin puts more weight than the story can bear on the fact that Freer was keen to have his museum in the nation's capital rather than, like most earlier collectors, in his home town. He wants to argue that the drive for a *national* museum was another aspect of the same nationalism (not imperialism) that took the Philippines. This will not do. From that day to this the United States has advanced in power and wealth and assertiveness, yet, for perfectly sound reasons, Americans found or support museums all across the country (as do patrons in other nations).

Professor Collin's difficulties arise from a determination to exaggerate two aspects of American culture in this period: its uniqueness, and its established share in a wider western culture. It may perhaps be argued of Japan, or even Germany, that their excesses in the first half of the twentieth century were in part the result of a desire to be taken seriously, to be treated as fully equal. Americans did not suffer from that sort of inferiority complex, and Theodore Roosevelt, a protean figure of many talents and interests, as little as any. However paradoxical it may be, it was American self-confidence that allowed both American imperialism — let the word be used — and American criticism of it, both American pride in American culture and American appreciation of other cultures both western and non-western.

University of Birmingham *A.E. Campbell*

Wilson and his Peacemakers: American Diplomacy at the Paris Peace Conference, 1919. **By Arthur Walworth.** London: W.W. Norton. 1986. xiii + 618 pp. £27.50.

This is an important work with some strengths, some weaknesses, and some limitations that are neither. Because it has been long in the making, the author has been able to interview some figures who will not be able to testify again. The title